

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/641,223	MOLESKY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Srirama Channavajjala	2166	

All Participants:
Status of Application: Allowed

 (1) Srirama Channavajjala.

(3) _____.

 (2) Shaun P. Montana, Reg. No. 54,320.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 11 September 2006
Time: 2.30 PM
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

previous office action mailed on 4/5/2006, and applicant's response filed on 7/10/2006

Claims discussed:

1-80

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

A telephone was made on 11 September 2006 to applicant's representative Attorney, Shaun P. Montana, Reg. No. 54,320 about the potential amendment to the claims 1, 11, 19, 29, 37, 47, 55, 63, 71, cancel claims 9-10, 17-18, 27-28, 35-36, 45-46, 53-54, 61-62, 69-70, 77-78, and amendment to specification at page 10, line 10-13 in order to allow the case. The representative agreed with the Examiner's proposal and authorization has given for an Examiner's Amendm. . .